

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE**

CLOUDING IP, LLC,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	C.A. No. 13-1458-LPS
)	
VERIZON ONLINE LLC, TERREMARK)	
NORTH AMERICA LLC and VERIZON)	
BUSINESS NETWORK SERVICES INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**REPLY BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MOTION OF DEFENDANTS
VERIZON ONLINE LLC, TERREMARK NORTH AMERICA LLC,
AND VERIZON BUSINESS NETWORK SERVICES INC.
TO DISMISS FOR LACK OF STANDING**

On December 20, 2013, Defendants Verizon Online LLC, Terremark North America LLC, and Verizon Business Network Services Inc. (collectively, “Verizon Defendants”) moved to dismiss Clouding IP’s complaint for lack of standing. In doing so, the Verizon Defendants incorporated the opening and reply briefs in support of Amazon’s motion to dismiss for lack of standing in *Clouding IP, LLC v. Amazon.com, Inc. et al.*, C.A. No. 12-641-LPS (the “Amazon Case.”), the opening and reply briefs in support of Google and Motorola Mobility’s motion to dismiss for lack of standing on the basis that the purported assignment of patent rights to Clouding IP, LLC is void as champertous in *Clouding IP, LLC v. Google Inc.*, C.A. No. 12-639-LPS (the “Google Case”) and *Clouding IP, LLC v. Motorola Mobility LLC*, C.A. No. 12-1078-LPS (the “Motorola Case”), the opening brief in support of Rackspace’s motion to dismiss for lack of standing filed in *Clouding IP, LLC v. Rackspace Hosting, Inc., et. al.*, C.A. No. 12-0675-LPS (the “Rackspace Case”), and the opening brief in support of EMC’s motion to dismiss based upon lack of standing in *Clouding IP, LLC v. EMC*

Corporation et al., C.A. No. 13-01455-LPS (the “EMC Case.”).

To avoid burdening the Court with duplicative briefs, the Verizon Defendants join, rely upon, and incorporate herein the arguments and authority described in the briefs previously incorporated as well as Rackspace’s reply brief in support of its motion to dismiss for lack of standing filed in the Rackspace Case (D.I. 173 in the Rackspace Case) and EMC’s reply brief in support of its motion to dismiss for lack of standing in the EMC Case (D.I. 42 in the EMC Case).

Respectfully submitted,

SEITZ ROSS ARONSTAM & MORITZ LLP

Of Counsel:

Thomas M. Dunham
Charles B. Molster, III
J. Michael Woods
Corrine M. Saylor
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 282-5000
tdunham@winston.com
[cmolster@winston.com](mailto:cмолster@winston.com)
mwoods@winston.com
csaylor@winston.com

/s/ Benjamin J. Schladweiler
Collins J. Seitz, Jr. (Bar No. 2237)
Benjamin J. Schladweiler (Bar No. 4601)
100 S. West Street, Suite 400
Wilmington, DE 19801
(302) 576-1600
cseitz@seitzross.com
bschladweiler@seitzross.com

*Counsel for Defendants Verizon Online
LLC, Terremark North America LLC and
Verizon Business Network Services Inc.*

*Counsel for Defendants Verizon Online
LLC, Terremark North America LLC and
Verizon Business Network Services Inc.*

Dated: January 15, 2014

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Benjamin J. Schladweiler, hereby certify that on January 15, 2014, I caused the foregoing ***Reply Brief in Support of Motion of Defendants Verizon Online LLC, Terremark North America LLC, and Verizon Business Network Services Inc. to Dismiss for Lack of Standing*** to be served via electronic mail upon the following individuals:

Richard D. Kirk
Stephen B. Brauerman
Vanessa R. Tiradentes
BAYARD, P.A.
222 Delaware Avenue, Suite 900
Wilmington, DE 19801
rkirk@bayardlaw.com
sbrauerman@bayardlaw.com
vtiradentes@bayardlaw.com

Marc A. Fenster
Brian D. Ledahl
Dorian S. Berger
RUSS AUGUST & KABAT
12424 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025
mfenster@raklaw.com
bledahl@raklaw.com
dberger@raklaw.com

Counsel for Plaintiff Clouding IP, LLC

Counsel for Plaintiff Clouding IP, LLC

/s/ Benjamin J. Schladweiler
Benjamin J. Schladweiler (Bar No. 4601)